arXiv:1612.01983v1 [math.PR] 6 Dec 2016

Three favorite sites occurs infinitely often for one-dimensional simple random walk

Jian Ding* University of Chicago

Jianfei Shen* University of Chicago

December 7, 2016

Abstract

For a one-dimensional simple random walk (S_t), for each time t we say a site x is a favorite site if it has the maximal local time. In this paper, we show that with probability 1 three favorite sites occurs infinitely often. Our work is inspired by Tóth (2001), and disproves a conjecture of Erdös and Révész (1984) and of Tóth (2001).

1 Introduction and main result

Let $S_t,\ t \in \mathbb{N}$ be a one-dimensional simple random walk with $S_0 = 0$. We define the local time at x by time t to be $L(t,x) = \#\{0 < k \leqslant t : S_k = x\}$. At time t, we say x is a favorite site if it has the maximal local time, i.e., $L(t,x) = \max_y L(t,y)$, and we say that *three favorite sites* occurs if there are exactly three sites which achieve the maximal local time. Our main result states that

Theorem 1.1. *For one-dimensional simple random walk, with probability 1 three favorite sites occurs infinitely often.*

Theorem 1.1 complements the result in [24] which showed that there are no more than three favorite sites eventually, and disproves a conjecture of Erdös and Révész [14, 15, 16] and of [24]. Previous to [24], it was shown in [25] that eventually there are no more than three favorite edges.

Besides the number of favorite sites, the asymptotic behavior of favorite sites have been much studied (see [23] for an overview): at time n as $n \to \infty$, it was shown in [3, 20] that the distance between the favorite sites and the origin in the infimum limit sense is about $\sqrt{n}/\mathrm{poly}(\log n)$ while in the supremum limit sense is about $\sqrt{2n \log\log n}$; it was proved in [8] that the distance between the edge of the range of random walk and the set of favorites increases as fast as $\sqrt{n}/(\log\log n)^{3/2}$; in [7] the jump size for the position of favorite site was studied and shown to be as large as $\sqrt{2n \log\log n}$; a number of other papers [12, 2, 21, 17, 13, 18, 6] studied similar questions in broader contexts including symmetric stable processes, random walks on random environments and so on.

In two dimensions and higher, favorite sites for simple random walks have been intensively studied where some intriguing fractal structure arise, see, e.g., [10, 9, 1, 22]. Such fractal structure also plays a central role in the study of cover times for random walks, see, e.g., [11, 5, 4]. We refrain from an extensive discussion on the literature on this topic as the mathematical connection

*Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1455049 and an Alfred Sloan fellowship.

to the concrete problem considered in the present article is limited. That being said, we remark that analogous questions on number of favorite sites in two dimensions and higher are of interest for future research, which we expect to be more closely related to the literature mentioned in this paragraph as well as references therein.

Our proof is inspired by [24], which in turn was inspired by [25]. Following [24], we define the number of upcrossings and downcrossings at x by the time t to be

$$U(t,x) = \#\{0 < k \leqslant t : S_k = x,\ S_{k-1} = x-1\},$$
$$D(t,x) = \#\{0 < k \leqslant t : S_k = x,\ S_{k-1} = x+1\}.$$

It is elementary to check that (see, e.g, [24, Equation (1.6)])

$$\begin{aligned} L(t,x) =& D(t,x) + D(t,x-1) + \mathbf{1}_{\{0<x\leqslant S(t)\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{S(t)<x\leqslant 0\}} \\ =& U(t,x) + U(t,x+1) + \mathbf{1}_{\{S(t)\leqslant x<0\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{0\leqslant x<S(t)\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The set of favorite (or most visited) sites $\mathscr{K}(t)$ of the random walk at time $t \in \mathbb{N}$ consists of those sites where the local time attains its maximum value, i.e.,

$$\mathscr{K}(t) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{Z} :\ L(t,y) = \max_{z\in\mathbb{Z}} L(t,z) \right\}.$$

For $r \geqslant 1$, let $f(r)$ be the (possibly infinite) number of times when the currently occupied site is one of the r favorites:

$$f(r) = \#\{t \geqslant 1 :\ S_t \in \mathscr{K}(t),\ \#\mathscr{K}(t) = r\}.$$

We remark that one of the main conceptual contributions in [24, 25] is the introduction of this function $f(r)$. Effectively, $f(r)$ counts the clusters of instances for r favorite sites; it is plausible that after the random walk leaves one of the favorite sites, within a non-negligible (random) number of steps those r favorite sites will remain favorite sites. Therefore, the expectation of $f(r)$ is significantly smaller than the expected number of t at which r favorite sites occurs, and in fact it was shown in [24] that $\mathbb{E}f(r) < \infty$ for all $r \geqslant 4$. It was then conjectured in [24] that $f(3) < \infty$ with probability 1, even though one expects $\mathbb{E}f(3) = \infty$. In the current article, we will show, using the idea of counting clusters in [24], that the correlation becomes so small that the first moment dictates the behavior. That is to say, we will show that

$$f(3) = \infty \text{ with probability 1}, \tag{2}$$

which then yields Theorem 1.1.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we will set up the framework of our proof following [24]; in Section 3 we first show that $f(3) = \infty$ with positive probability and then prove (2) by demonstrating a 0-1 law.

Acknowledgement. We thank Yueyun Hu and Zhan Shi for introducing the problem on favorite sites and for interesting discussions, and we thank Steve Lalley for many helpful discussions and useful comments for an early version of the manuscript.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the framework of [24] with suitable adaption to our setup, and collect a number of useful and well-understood facts.

2.1 Three consecutive favorite sites

It turns out that in order to show $f(3) = \infty$ it suffices to consider instances of three favorite sites which are consecutive. To this end, we define the inverse edge local times by

$$T_U(k,x) \triangleq \inf\{t \geqslant 1 :\ U(t,x) = k\} \text{ and } T_D(k,x) \triangleq \inf\{t \geqslant 1 :\ D(t,x) = k\}\,.$$

We consider the events of three consecutive favorite sites, i.e.,

$$A_{x,h}^{(k)} \triangleq \{\mathscr{K}(T_U(k+1,x)) = \{x, x+1, x+2\},\ L(T_U(k+1,x),x) = h\}\,.$$

We write the events in $T_U(k+1,x)$ rather than $T_U(k,x)$ as it matches the form of the Ray-Knight representation which we will discuss later. We then let $I_h = (\frac{1}{2}(h+\sqrt{h}), \frac{1}{2}(h+2\sqrt{h}))$ and define

$$N_H = \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x=1}^{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{A_{x,h}^{(k)}} \quad \text{and} \quad N = \lim_{H\to\infty} N_H = \sum_{h=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x=1}^{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{A_{x,h}^{(k)}}\,.$$

We observe that for each h, the events $A_{x,h}^{(k)}$ are mutually disjoint. In addition, we have that $f(3) \geqslant u(x)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) =& \sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{\{S(t-1)=x-1,\ S(t)=x,\ x\in\mathscr{K}(t),\ \#\mathscr{K}(t)=3\}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{\{x\in\mathscr{K}(T_U(k,x)),\ \#\mathscr{K}(T_U(k,x))=3\}} \\ =& \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{h=1}^{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{\{x\in\mathscr{K}(T_U(k+1),x),\ \#\mathscr{K}(T_U(k+1,x))=3,\ L(T_U(k+1,x),x)=h\}}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $f(3) \geqslant N$, and thus it suffices to show that $N = \infty$.

2.2 Additive processes and the Ray-Knight representation

Throughout this paper we denote by Y_t a critical Galton-Watson branching process with geometric offspring distribution and by Z_t, R_t critical geometric branching processes with one immigrant in each generation (in different ways). More precisely, we let $X_{t,i}$'s be i.i.d. geometric variables with mean 1 and recursively define

$$Z_{t+1} = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{Z_t+1} X_{t,i} \text{ and } R_{t+1} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{R_t} X_{t,i}\,. \tag{3}$$

One can verify that Y_t, Z_t and R_t are Markov chains with state space $\mathbb{Z}_+$ and transition probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} = j | Y_t = i) = \pi(i,j) \triangleq \begin{cases} \delta_0(j), & \text{if } i = 0, \\ 2^{-i-j}\ \frac{(i+j-1)!}{(i-1)!\ j!}, & \text{if } i > 0, \end{cases} \qquad (4) \\ &\mathbb{P}(Z_{t+1} = j | Z_t = i) = \rho(i,j) \triangleq \pi(i+1,j) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(R_{t+1} = j | R_t = i) = \rho^*(i,j) \triangleq \pi(i,j-1)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Let $k \geqslant 0$ and x be fixed integers. When $x \geqslant 1$, define the following three processes:

1. $(Z_t^{(k)})_{t\geqslant 0}$, is a Markov chain with transition probability $\rho(i,j)$ and initial state $Z_0 = k$.
2. $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t\geqslant -1}$, is a Markov chain with transition probabilities $\pi(i,j)$ and initial state $Y_{-1} = k$.

3. $(Y_t'^{(k)})_{t\geqslant 0}$, is a Markov chain with transition probabilities $\pi(i,j)$ and initial state $Y_0'^{(k)} = Z_{x-1}^{(k)}$.

The three processes are independent, except for the fact that $Y_t'^{(k)}$ starts from the terminal state of $Z_t^{(k)}$. We patch the three processes together to a single process:

$$\Delta_x^{(k)}(y) \triangleq \begin{cases} Z_{x-1-y}^{(k)}, & \text{if } 0 \leqslant y \leqslant x-1, \\ Y_{y-x}^{(k)}, & \text{if } x-1 \leqslant y \leqslant \infty, \\ Y_{-y}'^{(k)}, & \text{if } -\infty < y \leqslant 0. \end{cases}$$

We also define

$$\Lambda_x^{(k)}(y) \triangleq \Delta_x^{(k)}(y) + \Delta_x^{(k)}(y-1) + \mathbf{1}_{\{0<y\leqslant x\}}\,. \tag{5}$$

From the Ray-Knight Theorems on local time of simple random walks on $\mathbb{Z}$ (c.f. [19, Theorem 1.1]), it follows that for any integers $x \geqslant 1$ and $k \geqslant 0$,

$$(D(T_U(k+1,x),y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}) \overset{law}{=} (\Delta_x^{(k)}(y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}). \tag{6}$$

Using (1), (5) and (6), we get

$$(L(T_U(k+1,x),y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}) \overset{law}{=} (\Lambda_x^{(k)}(y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}). \tag{7}$$

Similarly, when $x \leqslant 0$, we define the processes

1. $(R_t^{(k)})_{t\geqslant 0}$, is a Markov chain with transition probability $\rho^*(i,j)$ and initial state $R_{-1} = k$.
2. $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t\geqslant 0}$, is a Markov chain with transition probabilities $\pi(i,j)$ and initial state $Y_0 = k$.
3. $(Y_t'^{(k)})_{t\geqslant -1}$, is a Markov chain with transition probabilities $\pi(i,j)$ and initial state $Y_{-1}'^{(k)} = R_{-1-x}^{(k)}$.

In this case, we patch the three processes together by

$$\Delta_x^{(k)}(y) \triangleq \begin{cases} Y_y'^{(k)}, & \text{if } -1 \leqslant y < \infty, \\ R_{y-x}, & \text{if } x-1 \leqslant y \leqslant -1, \\ Y_{x-1-y}^{(k)}, & \text{if } -\infty < y \leqslant x-1. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding $\Lambda_x^{(k)}$ is defined by $\Lambda_x^{(k)}(y) \triangleq \Delta_x^{(k)}(y) + \Delta_x^{(k)}(y-1) - \mathbf{1}_{\{x<y\leqslant 0\}}$. By classical Ray-Knight Theorems, we get the couplings for the case $k \geqslant 0$, $x \leqslant 0$:

$$(D(T_U(k+1,x),y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}) \overset{law}{=} (\Delta_x^{(k)}(y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}), \tag{8}$$

$$(L(T_U(k+1,x),y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}) \overset{law}{=} (\Lambda_x^{(k)}(y),\ y\in\mathbb{Z}). \tag{9}$$

In this paper, we will mainly use the Ray-Knight representation (6) and (7), while (8) and (9) will be used in the calculation of $\mathbb{E}N_H^2$. In the following, we default $x > 0$ unless mentioned otherwise.

2.3 Three favorite sites under Ray-Knight representation

To utilize (7), given the additive processes $Y_t^{(k)}$, $Z_t^{(k)}$ and $Y_t'^{(k)}$, we define

$$\tilde{Z}_t^{(k)} \triangleq Z_t^{(k)} + Z_{t-1}^{(k)} + 1, \qquad \tilde{Y}_t^{(k)} \triangleq Y_t^{(k)} + Y_{t-1}^{(k)}, \qquad \tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} \triangleq Y_t'^{(k)} + Y_{t-1}'^{(k)}.$$

For $h \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define the first hitting time of $[h, \infty)$ for $Y_t^{(k)}$ and $Z_t^{(k)}$ to be $\sigma_h^{(k)}$ and $\tau_h^{(k)}$ respectively and the extinction time of $Y_t^{(k)}$ to be $\omega^{(k)}$. That is,

$$\sigma_h^{(k)} \triangleq \inf\{t \geqslant 0 : \ Y_t^{(k)} \geqslant h\}, \quad \tau_h^{(k)} \triangleq \inf\{t \geqslant 0 : \ Z_t^{(k)} \geqslant h\}, \quad \omega^{(k)} = \inf\{t \geqslant 0 : \ Y_t^{(k)} = 0\}. \tag{10}$$

Correspondingly, we define the first hitting time of $[h, \infty)$ for the process $\tilde{Y}_t^{(k)}$ and $\tilde{Z}_t^{(k)}$ to be $\tilde{\sigma}_h^{(k)}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_h^{(k)}$ respectively. That is

$$\tilde{\sigma}_h^{(k)} \triangleq \inf\{t \geqslant 0 : \ \tilde{Y}_t^{(k)} \geqslant h\}, \qquad \tilde{\tau}_h^{(k)} \triangleq \inf\{t \geqslant 0 : \ \tilde{Z}_t^{(k)} \geqslant h\}.$$

Using the notation above, we can write $\mathbb{P}\left(A_{h,x}^{(k)}\right)$ in its Ray-Knight representation form:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(A_{h,x}^{(k)}\right) =& \mathbb{P}\Big(Y_0^{(k)} = h-k-1, \ Y_1^{(k)} = k+1, \ Y_2^{(k)} = h-k-1, \ \{\tilde{Y}_t^{(k)} < h, \text{ for } t \geqslant 3\}, \\ & \{\tilde{Z}_t^{(k)} < h, \text{ for } 1 \leqslant t \leqslant x-1\}, \ \{\tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} < h, \text{ for } t \geqslant 1\}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

For all the notations above, when the initial state of a process is obvious, we omit the superscript "(k)" to avoid cumbersome notations. We will also use conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid Y_0 = k)$ to indicate the initial state.

2.4 Standard lemmas

In this subsection we record a few well-understood lemmas that will be useful later.

Lemma 2.1. *[24, (6.14) – (6.15)] For any $0 \leqslant k \leqslant h \leqslant u$ the following overshoot bounds hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{\sigma_h} \geqslant u \middle| \ Y_0 = k, \ \sigma_h < \infty\right) \leqslant & \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \geqslant u | \ Y_0 = h, \ Y_1 \geqslant h) \\ \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{\tau_h} \geqslant u \middle| \ Z_0 = k\right) \leqslant & \mathbb{P}(Z_1 \geqslant u | \ Z_0 = h, \ Z_1 \geqslant h)\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.2. *We have that*

(i) For $i, j \in \left(\frac{1}{2}(h - 10\sqrt{h}), \ \frac{1}{2}(h + 10\sqrt{h})\right)$, there exist constants c and C such that $c \ h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant \pi(i,j) \leqslant C \ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $h \geqslant 1$.

(ii) For $i + j = h$, $\pi(i,j) \leqslant O(1) \ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

(iii) For $j < i_1 < i_2$, $\pi(i_1, j) > \pi(i_2, j)$.

Proof. Properties (i) and (ii) follow from straightforward computation using Stirling's formula and (4). For Property (iii), we see that $\frac{\pi(i+1,j)}{\pi(i,j)} = \frac{i+j}{2i} < 1$ for $j < i$, and (iii) follows from induction. □

Lemma 2.3. *We have that $\mathbb{E}\tau_h = \mathbb{E}Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_h | Z_0 = k\right] \geqslant h - k$.*

Proof. Applying the Optional Stopping Theorem to the martingale $Z_t - t$ at time τ_h, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\tau_h = \mathbb{E}Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0 \geqslant h - k.$$

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

3.1 Lower bound on the first moment

For $x > 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$, in order to bound the probability for three consecutive favorite sites with local time h at vertices x, $x+1$ and $x+2$, the main part is to control the probability for the local times below h everywhere except at x, $x+1$ and $x+2$. To this end, it suffices to consider the edge local times (i.e., number of downcrossings) in the Ray-Knight representation with appropriate conditioning in the region of $(x, x+2)$. Then in the region outside of $(0, x+2)$, these edge local times evolve as martingales (when looking forward spatially in $(x+2, \infty)$ and backward spatially in $(-\infty, 0)$) and it is fairly standard to control the probability of staying below the level h; in the region $(0, x)$, the edge local times are not exactly a martingale (when looking backward spatially; see (3)) and the analysis is slightly more complicated. In the next lemma, we prove a lower bound on the first moment of $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_h} \frac{h-Z_t}{h}$. Combined with standard martingale analysis in the region outside of $(0, x+2)$ and a change of summation when summing over x (see (15)), this will then give a lower bound on the first moment of N_H (see Proposition 3.2).

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $Z_0 = k \in [h - 2\sqrt{h}, h - \sqrt{h}]$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for sufficiently large h*

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_h} \frac{h-Z_t}{h}\big) \geqslant c\sqrt{h}\,.$$

Proof. Let $M_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t}(Z_s - s) - t(Z_t - t)$, and let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Z_0, Z_1, \ldots, Z_t)$. We see that

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t) = \big[\textstyle\sum_{s=1}^{t}(Z_s - s) + (Z_t - t)\big] - (t+1)(Z_t - t) = M_t\,.$$

Thus (M_t) is a martingale. By the Optional Stopping Theorem, we see that $\mathbb{E}\,(\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_h}(Z_t - t)) = \mathbb{E}\tau_h(Z_{\tau_h} - \tau_h)$ and hence

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_h} \frac{h-Z_t}{h}\big) = (1 + \frac{1}{2h})\mathbb{E}\tau_h - \frac{1}{h}\mathbb{E}[\tau_h Z_{\tau_h} - \frac{1}{2}\tau_h^2]. \tag{11}$$

Now consider the process $M'_t = -\frac{1}{4}Z_t^2 + tZ_t - \frac{1}{2}t^2 + \frac{1}{4}t$. By (3), we see that

$$\mathbb{E}(M'_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t) = -\frac{1}{4}(Z_t^2 + 4Z_t + 3) + (tZ_t + Z_t + t + 1) - \frac{1}{2}(t^2 + 2t + 1) + \frac{1}{4}(t+1) = M'_t\,.$$

So (M'_t) is a martingale. Using the Optional Stopping Theorem to (M'_t) at τ_h, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_h Z_{\tau_h} - \tfrac{1}{2}\tau_h^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\tfrac{1}{4}Z_{\tau_h}^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}\tau_h\right] - \tfrac{1}{4}Z_0^2 = \tfrac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}(Z_{\tau_h}^2 - Z_0^2) - \tfrac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}\tau_h\,. \tag{12}$$

Combining (11), (12) and Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_h} \frac{h-Z_t}{h}\right] &= (1 + \frac{1}{4h})\mathbb{E}\tau_h - \frac{1}{4h}\mathbb{E}\left[Z_{\tau_h}^2 - Z_0^2\right] \\
&= (1 + \frac{1}{4h})\mathbb{E}(Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0) - \frac{1}{4h}\mathbb{E}[(Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0)(Z_{\tau_h} + Z_0)] \\
&\geqslant \frac{1}{4h}\mathbb{E}[(Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0)(4h - (Z_{\tau_h} + Z_0))]\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously $Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0 \geqslant h - k \geqslant \sqrt{h}$ and by Lemma 2.1 we have that $\mathbb{E}(Z_{\tau_h} - Z_0)(Z_{\tau_h} + Z_0 - 2h) = O(h)$. Therefore there is a constant c such that $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_h} \frac{h-Z_t}{h}\right] \geqslant c\sqrt{h}$ for sufficiently large h. □

Proposition 3.2. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}N_H \geqslant c \log H$.*

Proof. In what follows, c_i for $i \geqslant 1$ and c are all constants. By the Ray-Knight Representation,

$$\mathbb{E}N_H = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_0^{(k)} = h-k-1,\ Y_1^{(k)} = k+1,\ Y_2^{(k)} = h-k-1,\ \{\tilde{Y}_t^{(k)} < h, \quad \text{for } t \geqslant 3\}\right)$$
$$\cdot \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\{\tilde{Z}_t^{(k)} < h,\ 1 \leqslant t \leqslant x-1\},\ \{\tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} < h, \quad \text{for } t \geqslant 1\}\right).$$

Thus, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}N_H \geqslant \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \pi(l, h-k-1)\ \pi(h-k-1, k+1)\ \pi(k+1, h-k-1)$$
$$\cdot\, \mathbb{P}(Y_t^{(h-k-1)} < \tfrac{1}{2}h \text{ for } t \geqslant 0) \cdot \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_h \geqslant x,\ \{\tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} < h, \quad \text{for } t \geqslant 1\}).$$

By Lemma 2.2 (i), all $\pi(\cdot,\cdot)$ in the above equation are at the scale $h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Since Y_t is a martingale, by using the Optional Stopping Theorem at $\sigma_{\frac{h}{2}} \wedge \omega$ where $\sigma_{\frac{h}{2}}$ and ω are defined in (10), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_t^{(h-k-1)} < \tfrac{h}{2} \text{ for } t \geqslant 0) = \mathbb{P}(Y_t^{(h-k-1)} \text{ hits 0 before } \tfrac{h}{2}) \geqslant \tfrac{h/2-(h-k-1)}{h/2} \geqslant c_1 h^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

So we get

$$\mathbb{E}N_H \geqslant c_2 h^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_h \geqslant x,\ \{\tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} < h,\ t \geqslant 1\}\right). \tag{13}$$

Let $k_1 = \frac{1}{2}(h - 2\sqrt{h})$. By the independence structure in the Ray-Knight representation,

$$\sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_h \geqslant x,\ \{\tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} < h, \quad \text{for } t \geqslant 1\}\right)$$
$$\geqslant \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_1^{(k)} \leqslant k_1,\ Z_t^{(k)} < \frac{h}{2} \text{ for } 2 \leqslant t \leqslant x-1, \quad \{Y_t'^{(k)} < \frac{h}{2}, \quad \text{for } t \geqslant 1\}\right)$$
$$\geqslant \sum_{x=2}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{[\frac{h}{2}-1]} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_1^{(k)} \leqslant k_1\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\ Z_t^{(k_1)} < \frac{h}{2} \text{ for } 1 \leqslant t \leqslant x-2,\ Z_{x-2}^{(k_1)} = l\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(Y_t^{(l)} \text{ hits 0 before } \frac{h}{2}\right).$$

By Lemma 2.2 (i), $\mathbb{P}(Z_1^{(k)} \leqslant k_1) \geqslant c_3$. Using the Optional Stopping Theorem again, we have $\mathbb{P}\left(Y_t^{(l)} \text{ hits 0 before } \frac{h}{2}\right) \geqslant \frac{h/2-l}{h/2}$. So

$$\sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_h \geqslant x,\ \{\tilde{Y}_t'^{(k)} < h,\ t \geqslant 1\}\right) \geqslant c_3 \cdot \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{[\frac{h}{2}-1]} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{h/2}^{(k_1)} \geqslant x,\ Z_{x-1}^{(k_1)} = l\right) \cdot \frac{h/2-l}{h/2}. \tag{14}$$

By interchange of the summation and the expectation (which is valid by the Monotone Convergence Theorem) and Lemma 3.1, we have that the right hand side of (14) is equal to

$$c_3 \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=0}^{[\frac{h}{2}-1]} \sum_{x=1}^{\tau_{h/2}^{(k_1)}} \frac{h/2-l}{h/2} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\left\{Z_{x-1}^{(k_1)}=l\right\}}\right] = c_3 \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t=0}^{\tau_{h/2}^{(k_1)}-1} \frac{h/2 - Z_t^{(k_1)}}{h/2}\Big) \geqslant c_4 \sqrt{h}\,, \tag{15}$$

where in the second inequality we did change of variable $t = x - 1$. Thus by (13) and (15),

$$\mathbb{E}N_H \geqslant \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{k \in I_h} c_5\ h^{-\frac{3}{2}} \geqslant c_6 \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{H} \frac{1}{h} \geqslant c \log H\,. \qquad \square$$

3.2 Upper bound on the second moment

The calculation of second moment involves the two three favorite sites that happen in chronological order. The key insight is that two instances of three favorite sites with no spatial overlap are almost independent. Before giving the bound for the second moment, we discuss some useful concepts and tools that characterize the independence of different three favorite sites.

Let $D(t) = (D(t,x), x \in \mathbb{Z}) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the random vector that records the number of downcrossings of each site by the time t. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we use $\ell(i)$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ to denote the i-th component of ℓ. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, define $B_x(\ell) = \{\exists t < \infty :\ D(t) = \ell,\ S(t-1) = x-1,\ S(t) = x\}$. Note that if $B_x(\ell)$ happens, there exists a unique $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D(t) = \ell$, $S(t-1) = x-1$ and $S(t) = x$. Sometimes we abuse the terminology "after $B_x(\ell)$ happens" by meaning "after the unique t with $D(t) = \ell,\ S(t-1) = x-1,\ S(t) = x$". We also say "$B_x(\ell)$ happens before $B_{x'}(\ell')$" by meaning the unique t (corresponding to $B_x(\ell)$) is less than the unique t' (corresponding to $B_{x'}(\ell')$).

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{\ell : \mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell)) > 0 \text{ for some } x\}$. Clearly for any $\ell \in \mathcal{P}$, ℓ has compact support. For $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}$, denote $B_x(\mathcal{Q}) = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{Q}} B_x(\ell)$. Then we have $A_{x,h}^{(k)} = B_x(\mathcal{P}_{x,h}^{(k)})$ where $\mathcal{P}_{x,h}^{(k)}$ is the collection of $\ell \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\ell(x-1) = k,\ \ell(x) = h-k-1,\ \ell(x+1) = k+1,\ \ell(x+2) = h-k-1\,; \\ &\ell(i-1) + \ell(i) < h \text{ for all } i \neq x, x+1, x+2\,. \end{aligned}$$

Our main intuition on bounding the correlation between two instances of three favorite sites is the following: Suppose at some time we have an instance of three favorite points at $x, x+1, x+2$ with edge local time (i.e., downcrossings) given by ℓ, then the edge local time at a later time is ℓ superposed with an independent edge local time field which we denote by $\tilde{\ell}$. If the field $(\ell + \tilde{\ell})$ produces three favorite sites which are spatially different from those of ℓ, then the field $(\ell' + \tilde{\ell})$ also produces three favorite sites as long as ℓ' is one of *many* local perturbations of ℓ (and in particular ℓ' has a unique favorite site). This is to say, the fact that ℓ has three favorite sites is not crucial for $(\ell + \tilde{\ell})$ to have three favorite sites — this is a manifestation of uncorrelation between the two events. In order to carry out the heuristics formally, we let $\mathscr{A}$ be the set of all subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ and define a map $\varphi_x : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \mathscr{A}$ mapping an $\ell \in \mathcal{P}$ to a collection of vectors where we locally push down the values at locations $x+1$ and $x+2$. More precisely, we define

$$\varphi_x(\ell) = \{\ell^* \in \mathcal{P} :\ \ell^*(i) < \ell(i) \text{ for } i = x+1, x+2,\ \ell^*(i) = \ell(i) \text{ for } i \neq x+1, x+2\}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *For $i = 1, 2$ and $\ell_i^* \in \varphi_{x_i}(\ell_i)$ with $\ell_i \in \mathcal{P}_{x_i,h}^{(k_i)}$, we have that $B_{x_1}(\ell_1^*) \cap B_{x_2}(\ell_2^*) = \emptyset$ if $(x_1, \ell_1) \neq (x_2, \ell_2)$. Further, we have $B_{x_1}(\ell_1^*) \cap B_{x_2}(\ell_2^*) = \emptyset$ if $(x_1, \ell_1) = (x_2, \ell_2)$ but $\ell_1^* \neq \ell_2^*$.*

Proof. Case (i): Suppose $x_1 \neq x_2$. Since clearly $B_{x_1}(\ell_1^*)$ and $B_{x_2}(\ell_2^*)$ cannot happen at the same time t, we can then assume without loss of generality that $B_{x_1}(\ell_1^*)$ happens first. Then when $B_{x_2}(\ell_2^*)$ happens the vertex local time at x_1 is at least h, arriving at a contradiction.
Case (ii): Suppose that $x_1 = x_2$ but $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$. In this case, we have $\ell_1^* \neq \ell_2^*$. Since clearly $B_{x_1}(\ell_1^*)$ and $B_{x_2}(\ell_2^*)$ cannot happen at the same time t, we can then assume without loss of generality that $B_{x_1}(\ell_1^*)$ happens first. In order for $B_{x_2}(\ell_2^*)$ to happen, the random walk has to leave $x_1 (= x_2)$ and revisit x_1. As a result, the vertex local time at x_1 will be strictly larger than h, arriving at a contradiction.
Case (iii): Suppose that $x_1 = x_2, \ell_1 = \ell_2$ but $\ell_1^* \neq \ell_2^*$. This follows from the same reasoning as in Case (ii). □

Lemma 3.4. *There exist a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $\ell \in P_{x,h}^{(k)}$ with $k \in I_h$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(B_x(\varphi_x(\ell))\right) \geqslant ch\mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell))\,.$$

Proof. We consider $\ell^* \in \varphi_x(\ell)$ such that $\ell^*(x+1) \in [k+1-\sqrt{h}, k+1)$ and $\ell^*(x+2) \in [h-k-1-\sqrt{h}, h-k-1)$. According to Lemma 2.2 (i) and (iii), there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell^*))}{\mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell))} = \frac{\pi(\ell^*(x), \ell^*(x+1)) \cdot \pi(\ell^*(x+1), \ell^*(x+2)) \cdot \pi(\ell^*(x+2), \ell(x+3))}{\pi(h-k-1, k+1) \cdot \pi(k+1, h-k-1) \cdot \pi(h-k-1, \ell(x+3))} \geqslant c\,.$$

Note that there are about h of such $\ell^* \in \varphi_x(\ell)$ that satisfy the inequality. By Lemma 3.3, we get that $\mathbb{P}(B_x(\varphi_x(\ell))) \geqslant ch\mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell))$. □

Proposition 3.5. *We have that $\mathbb{E}N_H^2 = O(\log H) \cdot \mathbb{E}N_H$.*

Proof. We decompose the second moment into the following three parts:

$$\mathbb{E}N_H^2 = 2 \sum_{1 \leqslant h < h' \leqslant H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \sum_{k' \in I_{h'}} \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \sum_{x'=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(A_{x,h}^{(k)},\ A_{x',h'}^{(k')}\right) + \mathbb{E}N_H \leqslant O(1) \cdot (\mathrm{I} + \mathrm{II} + \mathbb{E}N_H)\,, \tag{16}$$

where

$$\mathrm{I} = \sum_{1 \leqslant h < h' \leqslant H} \sum_{k' \in I_{h'}} \sum_{k \in I_h} \sum_{|x'-x|>3} \mathbb{P}\left(A_{x,h}^{(k)},\ A_{x',h'}^{(k')}\right)\,,$$
$$\mathrm{II} = \sum_{1 \leqslant h < h' \leqslant H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \sum_{k' \in I_{h'}} \sum_{|x'-x| \leqslant 3} \mathbb{P}\left(A_{x,h}^{(k)},\ A_{x',h'}^{(k')}\right)\,.$$

First we estimate I. By the Strong Markov Property,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(A_{x,h}^{(k)},\ A_{x',h'}^{(k')}\right) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{P}_{x,h}^{(k)}} \sum_{\ell' \in \mathcal{P}_{x',h'}^{(k')}} \mathbb{P}\left(B_x(\ell),\ B_{x'}(\ell')\right) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{P}_{x,h}^{(k)}} \sum_{\tilde{\ell}:\ \ell + \tilde{\ell} \in \mathcal{P}_{x',h'}^{(k')}} \mathbb{P}^0\left(B_x(\ell)\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}^x(B_{x'}(\tilde{\ell}))$$

where the x in $\mathbb{P}^x$ indicates the starting point of the random walk. For any $x' \in Z_+$ and $k' \in I_{h'}$, using Lemma 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x:|x-x'|>3}\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h},\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\right) &= \sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x:|x-x'|>3}\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{x,h}}\sum_{\tilde{\ell}:\ \ell+\tilde{\ell}\in\mathcal{P}^{(k')}_{x',h'}}\mathbb{P}^0(B_x(\ell))\cdot\mathbb{P}^x(B_{x'}(\tilde{\ell}))\\ &\leqslant \sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x:|x-x'|>3}\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{x,h}}\sum_{\tilde{\ell}:\ \ell+\tilde{\ell}\in\mathcal{P}^{(k')}_{x',h'}} O(1)h^{-1}\ \mathbb{P}^0\left(B_x(\varphi_x(\ell))\right)\cdot\mathbb{P}^x(B_{x'}(\tilde{\ell}))\\ &\leqslant O(1)h^{-1}\sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x:|x-x'|>3}\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{x,h}}\sum_{\ell^*\in\varphi_x(\ell)}\sum_{\tilde{\ell}:\ \ell+\tilde{\ell}\in\mathcal{P}^{(k')}_{x',h'}}\mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell^*),\ B_{x'}(\ell^*+\tilde{\ell}))\,.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Lemma 3.3 and Strong Markov Property. By Lemma 3.3, all events $B_x(\ell^*)$ for $x\in\mathbb{N}$, $\ell^*\in\varphi_x(\ell)$, $k\in I_h$ and $\ell\in\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{x,h}$ are disjoint. Note that $|x-x'|>3$ and φ_x only reduces the downcrossing number at $x+1$, $x+2$. So $\ell^*+\tilde{\ell}\in\mathcal{P}^{(k')}_{x',h'}$. Hence we have

$$\sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{x:|x-x'|>3}\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h},\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\right)\leqslant O(1)h^{-1}\textstyle\sum_{\ell'\in\mathcal{P}^{(k')}_{x',h'}}\mathbb{P}\left(B_{x'}(\ell')\right)\,.$$

As a result, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}\leqslant& O(1)\sum_{1\leqslant h<h'\leqslant H}h^{-1}\sum_{k'\in I_{h'}}\sum_{x'=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\right)\\ \leqslant& O(1)\left(\sum_{h=1}^{H}h^{-1}\right)\left(\sum_{h'=1}^{H}\sum_{k'\in I_{h'}}\sum_{x'=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\right)\right)=O(1)\log H\cdot\mathbb{E}N_H\,.\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

It remains to estimate II. In the case where the locations for favorite sites have overlap, we do have strong correlation between the two events. However, due to the overlap of locations for favorite sites the enumeration is hugely reduced. As a result the contribution to the second moment in this case can also be controlled, as we show in what follows.

Since $A^{(k'_1)}_{x',h'}\cap A^{(k'_2)}_{x',h'}=\emptyset$ for $k_1\neq k_2$, we have

$$\mathrm{II}\leqslant\sum_{x=1}^{\infty}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k\in I_h}\sum_{h'=h+1}^{H}7\cdot\sup_{x':\ |x'-x|\leqslant 3}\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h},\ \{\exists k':\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\}\right)\,.$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h},\ \{\exists k':\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\}\right)=\sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{x,h}}\mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell))\cdot\mathbb{P}\left(\exists k':\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\middle|\ B_x(\ell)\right)$. Conditioning on $B_x(\ell)$, in order for the event $\left\{\exists k':\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\right\}$ to occur, we must have:

(1) There exists a $k'\geqslant\ell(x')$ such that at some time t, $S(t-1)=x'-1$, $S(t)=x'$ and $D(t,x'-1)=k'$, $D(t,x')=h'-k'-1$ (if such k' exists, it is unique).

(2) Once (1) happens, both t and k' are determined. The additional process after $B_x(\ell)$ need to satisfy: $D(t,x'+1)-\ell(x'+1)=h'-k'-1-\ell(x'+1)$ and $D(t,x'+2)-\ell(x'+2)=k'+1-\ell(x'+2)$.

(3) $L(t,y) < h'$ for all $y \neq x', x'+1, x'+2$.

We omit the probability loss for (1) and (3) and only consider the probability for (2). Formally, define T to be the time t such that $S(t-1) = x'-1,\ S(t) = x',\ D(t,x'-1) + D(t,x') = h'-1$. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists k' :\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'} \middle|\ B_x(\ell)\right) \leqslant \sum_{k'=\ell(x')}^{h'} \mathbb{P}\big(T = T_U(k'+1,x'),\ D(T,x') = h'-k'-1,\\ D(T,x'+1) = k'+1,\ D(T,x'+2) = h'-k'-1\big)\,.$$

Using the Ray-Knight Representation for the random walk started at x after $B_x(\ell)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists k' :\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'} \middle|\ B_x(\ell)\right) \leqslant \sum_{k'=\ell(x')}^{h'} \mathbb{P}\big(T = T_U(k'+1,x'),\ D(T,x') = h'-k'-1\big)\\ \cdot\pi^*(h'-k'-1-\ell(x'),\ k'+1-\ell(x'+1)) \cdot \pi^*(k'+1-\ell(x'+1),\ h'-k'-1-\ell(x'+2))\,.$$

where $\pi^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ is either $\pi(\cdot,\cdot)$ or $\rho^*(\cdot,\cdot)$ depending on the relative position of x and x' (see (6) and (8)). Since both $(h'-k'-1-\ell_x(x'))+(k'+1-\ell(x'+1))$ and $(k'+1-\ell(x'+1))+(h'-k'-1-\ell(x'+2))$ are greater than or equal to $h'-h$, by Lemma 2.2 (ii) and the relation $\rho^*(i,j) = \pi(i,j-1)$, the inequality

$$\pi^*(h'-k'-1-\ell(x'),k'+1-\ell(x'+1)) \cdot \pi^*(k'+1-\ell(x'+1),h'-k'-1-\ell(x'+2)) \leqslant \frac{O(1)}{h'-h}$$

holds for any $\ell(x') \leqslant k' \leqslant h'$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists k' :\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'} \middle|\ B_x(\ell)\right) \leqslant \sum_{k'=\ell(x')}^{h'} \mathbb{P}\big(T = T_U(k'+1,x'),\ D(T,x') = h'-k'-1\big) \cdot \frac{O(1)}{h'-h}\\ = \mathbb{P}\left(\exists k' : T = T_U(k'+1,x'),\ D(T,x') = h'-k'-1\big)\right) \cdot \frac{O(1)}{h'-h} \leqslant \frac{O(1)}{h'-h}\,.$$

As a consequence, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h},\ \{\exists k' :\ A^{(k')}_{x',h'}\}\right) \leqslant \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}_{x,h}} \mathbb{P}(B_x(\ell)) \cdot \frac{O(1)}{h'-h} = \frac{O(1)}{h'-h} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h}\right)$$

and thus

$$\mathrm{II} \leqslant \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \sum_{h'=h+1}^{H} \frac{O(1)}{h'-h} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(A^{(k)}_{x,h}\right) \leqslant O(\log H) \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{k \in I_h} \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A^{(k)}_{x,h}) = O(\log H)\mathbb{E}N_H\,. \quad (18)$$

Combining (16), (17) and (18), we conclude that $\mathbb{E}N_H^2 = O(\log H)\mathbb{E}N_H$. □

We are now ready to show that $N = \infty$ with positive probabiity.

Proposition 3.6. *There exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(N = \infty) \geqslant \delta$ where $N = \lim_{H\to\infty} N_H$.*

Proof. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}N_H = \mathbb{E}N_H\mathbf{1}_{\{N_H>\log\log H\}} + \mathbb{E}N_H\mathbf{1}_{\{N_H\leqslant\log\log H\}} \leqslant \sqrt{\mathbb{E}N_H^2\cdot\mathbb{P}(N_H>\log\log H)} + \log\log H\,.$$

By Propositions 3.2 and 3.5, there exist constants $c,\delta>0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(N_H>\log\log H) \geqslant \frac{(\mathbb{E}N_H-\log\log H)^2}{\mathbb{E}N_H^2} \geqslant c\frac{\mathbb{E}N_H\log H}{\mathbb{E}N_H^2} \geqslant \delta\,,$$

for all sufficiently large H. By letting $H\to\infty$, we get that $\mathbb{P}(N=\infty)\geqslant\delta$. □

3.3 0-1 Law

In this section, building on Proposition 3.6 we show that $N=\infty$ occurs with probability 1. There are a few possible approaches, and here we choose to prove a 0-1 law taking advantage of the result on the transience of favorite sites. Let $V(t)$ be an arbitrary element in $\mathscr{K}(t)$. It was shown in [3] that uniformly in all $V(t)\in\mathscr{K}(t)$ we have with probability 1

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty}\frac{|V(t)|}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log t)^{-11}}=\infty\,. \tag{19}$$

Denote $\psi(t)=t^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log t)^{-11}$ and $E=\left\{\liminf_{t\to\infty}|V(t)|\geqslant\psi(t)\right\}$. By (19), we have $\mathbb{P}(E)=1$, and thus without loss of generality we can assume that E occurs in what follows. Our goal is to show that the event $\{f(3)=\infty\}$ is a tail event and it suffices to show that the event $\{f(3)=\infty\}$ is independent of any σ-field F_m (which is the σ-field generated by the first m steps of the random walk) for all $m\in\mathbb{N}$. To this end, for each $m\in\mathbb{N}$ we let M be the first time such that for all $t\geqslant M$ favorite sites occurs outside of $[-2m,2m]$. We see that M is not necessarily a stopping time but $M<\infty$ with probability 1. Therefore, the event $\{f(3)=\infty\}$ depends only on whether after M three favorite sites occurs infinitely often. Now consider the event $\{f_m(3)=\infty\}$ where $f_m(3)$ is defined analogously to $f(3)$ but for the random walk started at time m. We claim that the symmetric difference between $\{f(3)=\infty\}$ and $\{f_m(3)=\infty\}$ has probability zero since in the symmetric difference one must have a favorite site (for the original random walk) in the interval $[-2m,2m]$ after M. Therefore, the event $\{f(3)=\infty\}$ is independent of F_m for all $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and thus is a tail event. By Kolmogorov's 0-1 law, $\mathbb{P}(f(3)=\infty)\in\{0,1\}$. Combined with Proposition 3.6, it completes the proof of (2).

References

[1] Y. Abe. Maximum and minimum of local times for two-dimensional random walk. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 20:no. 22, 14, 2015.

[2] R. F. Bass, N. Eisenbaum, and Z. Shi. The most visited sites of symmetric stable processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 116(3):391–404, 2000.

[3] R. F. Bass and P. S. Griffin. The most visited site of Brownian motion and simple random walk. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 70(3):417–436, 1985.

[4] D. Belius. Gumbel fluctuations for cover times in the discrete torus. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 157(3-4):635–689, 2013.

[5] D. Belius and N. Kistler. The subleading order of two dimensional cover times. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–92, 2016.

[6] D. Chen, L. de Raphélis, and Y. Hu. Favorite sites of randomly biased walks on a supercritical Galton–Watson tree. arXiv 1611.04497.

[7] E. Csáki, P. Révész, and Z. Shi. Favourite sites, favourite values and jump sizes for random walk and Brownian motion. *Bernoulli*, 6(6):951–975, 2000.

[8] E. Csáki and Z. Shi. Large favourite sites of simple random walk and the Wiener process. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 3:no. 14, 31 pp. (electronic), 1998.

[9] A. Dembo. Favorite points, cover times and fractals. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics*, volume 1869 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–101. Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[10] A. Dembo, Y. Peres, J. Rosen, and O. Zeitouni. Thick points for planar Brownian motion and the Erdős-Taylor conjecture on random walk. *Acta Math.*, 186(2):239–270, 2001.

[11] A. Dembo, Y. Peres, J. Rosen, and O. Zeitouni. Cover times for Brownian motion and random walks in two dimensions. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 160(2):433–464, 2004.

[12] N. Eisenbaum. On the most visited sites by a symmetric stable process. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 107(4):527–535, 1997.

[13] N. Eisenbaum and D. Khoshnevisan. On the most visited sites of symmetric Markov processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 101(2):241–256, 2002.

[14] P. Erdős and P. Révész. On the favourite points of random walks. *Mathematical Structures omputational Mathematics athematical Modelling (Sofia)*, 2:152–157, 1984.

[15] P. Erdős and P. Révész. Problems and results on random walks. In *Mathematical statistics and probability theory, Vol. B (Bad Tatzmannsdorf, 1986)*, pages 59–65. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1987.

[16] P. Erdős and P. Révész. Three problems on the random walk in $\mathbf{Z}^d$. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 26(2-3):309–320, 1991.

[17] Y. Hu and Z. Shi. The problem of the most visited site in random environment. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 116(2):273–302, 2000.

[18] Y. Hu and Z. Shi. The most visited sites of biased random walks on trees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20:no. 62, 14, 2015.

[19] F. B. Knight. Random walks and a sojourn density process of Brownian motion. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 109:56–86, 1963.

[20] M. A. Lifshits and Z. Shi. The escape rate of favorite sites of simple random walk and Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1A):129–152, 2004.

[21] M. B. Marcus. The most visited sites of certain Lévy processes. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 14(3):867–885, 2001.

[22] I. Okada. Topics and problems on favorite sites of random walks. arXiv 1606.03787.

[23] Z. Shi and B. Tóth. Favourite sites of simple random walk. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 41(1-2):237–249, 2000. Endre Csáki 65.

[24] B. Tóth. No more than three favorite sites for simple random walk. *Ann. Probab.*, 29(1):484–503, 2001.

[25] B. Tóth and W. Werner. Tied favourite edges for simple random walk. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 6(3):359–369, 1997.